

REMARKS

Applicant has studied the Office action dated April 19, 2004, and has made amendments to the claims. Claims 1 and 4 have been amended. Claims 1-7 are pending. No new matter has been added. It is submitted that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Amendment to the Specification

An amendment has been made to the specification at page 1 to claim foreign priority. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

Claim for Foreign Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

In the Office action, the Examiner acknowledged the Applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119. However, the Examiner noted that Applicant had not filed a certified copy of the Korean application from which priority is claimed. Applicant respectfully submits that a certified copy of Korean application No. 2000-0087094 was filed in the USPTO on December 28, 2001. Therefore, acknowledgment of the receipt of the certified copy of the priority document is requested.

Objection

The specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Specifically, regarding claim 6, the Examiner stated that the specification does not disclose the glaze glass is reduced to powder of which the grain size is over 10 microns. Applicant respectfully submits that on page 14, lines 8-9, the specification recites: "The glazing glass powder 71 is reduced to powder so as to have a grain size over 10 μm" Therefore, it is submitted that no correction to the specification regarding claim 6 is necessary and requested that the objection be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the barrier rib forming glass having a grain size, does not reasonably

provide enablement for the actual grain size. In particular, claim 4 discloses that the grain size is 2-4 microns; however, the specification teaches that the grain size is to be greater than 2-4 microns. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 4 has been amended to recite that the grain size is greater than 2-4 microns. Thus, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 3, 5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sreeram et al (WO 98 497706 A). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to disclose a functional sheet including a glazing layer and a barrier rib layer on the glazing layer. Support for the amendment is found throughout the specification. In contrast, Sreeram et al. discloses a green sheet having only the barrier rib material. In order to bond the green sheet on the substrate in Sreeram et al., the glazing glass powder must be reduced to a fine powder and then sprayed on the substrate. Thus, Applicant submits that Sreeram et al. does not teach or suggest both the barrier rib material and the glazing material being included in the green sheet, as claimed in amended claim 1. In view of this, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and the claims dependent are now allowable.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Sreeram et al. The Examiner stated that Sreeram et al. discloses all of the claimed limitations except for the particular grain size. The Examiner further stated that Sreeram et al., however, teaches the general conditions for the grain size, and since the Applicant has not disclosed any criticality for the claimed grain size, the claimed grain size appears to be an obvious choice in design. This rejection is respectfully traversed. In view of the amendment to claim 1, the claim from which claims 4 and 6 indirectly depend from, and the arguments made against the § 102 rejection above, the Applicant submits that Sreeram et al. is not an appropriate basis for a § 103 rejection. Therefore, the claimed grain sizes in claims 4 and 6 respectively are not obvious design choices. Respectfully, Applicant submits that claims 4 and 6 are allowable over the cited reference.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicant submits that the present Amendment places all claims of the present application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California, telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka

Date: July 19, 2004

By:



Lew Edward V. Macapagal

Registration No. 55,416

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Customer No. 035884

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka
801 S. Figueroa Street, 14th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: 213-623-2221
Facsimile: 213-623-2211